

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1300

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 6392, SYSTEMIC RISK DESIGNATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 6392 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SYSTEMIC RISK DESIGNATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 934, I call up the bill (H.R. 6392) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 934, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6392

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended by striking the item relating to section 113 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 113. Authority to require enhanced supervision and regulation of certain nonbank financial companies and certain bank holding companies."

SEC. 3. REVISIONS TO COUNCIL AUTHORITY.

(a) PURPOSES AND DUTIES.—Section 112 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5322) is amended in subsection (a)(2)(I) by inserting before the semicolon ", which have been the subject of a final determination under section 113".

(b) BANK HOLDING COMPANY DESIGNATION.—Section 113 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5323) is amended—

(1) by amending the heading for such section to read as follows: "AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND REGULATION OF CERTAIN NONBANK FINANCIAL COMPANIES AND CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES";

(2) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) BANK HOLDING COMPANIES SUBJECT TO ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS UNDER SECTION 165.—

"(1) DETERMINATION.—The Council, on a nondelegable basis and by a vote of not fewer than 2/3 of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, may determine that a bank holding company shall be subject to enhanced supervision and prudential standards by the Board of Governors, in accordance with section 165, if the Council determines, based on the considerations in paragraph (2), that material financial distress at the bank holding company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of the bank holding company, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States.

"(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In making a determination under paragraph (1), the Council shall use the indicator-based measurement approach established by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision to determine systemic importance, which considers—

"(A) the size of the bank holding company;

"(B) the interconnectedness of the bank holding company;

"(C) the extent of readily available substitutes or financial institution infrastructure for the services of the bank holding company;

"(D) the global cross-jurisdictional activity of the bank holding company; and

"(E) the complexity of the bank holding company.

"(3) GSIBS DESIGNATED BY OPERATION OF LAW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a bank holding company that is designated, as of the date of enactment of this subsection, as a Global Systemically Important Bank by the Financial Stability Board shall be deemed to have been the subject of a final determination under paragraph (1).";

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking "subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2)" and inserting "subsection (a)(2), (b)(2), or (c)(2)"; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking "Subsections (d) through (h)" and inserting "Subsections (e) through (i)";

(5) in subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j)—

(A) by striking "subsections (a) and (b)" each place such term appears and inserting "subsections (a), (b), and (c)"; and

(B) by striking "nonbank financial company" each place such term appears and inserting "bank holding company for which there has been a determination under subsection (c) or nonbank financial company";

(6) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking "subsection (e)" and inserting "subsection (f)";

(7) in subsection (h), as so redesignated, by striking "subsection (a), (b), or (c)" and inserting "subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d)"; and

(8) in subsection (i), as so redesignated, by striking "subsection (d)(2), (e)(3), or (f)(5)" and inserting "subsection (e)(2), (f)(3), or (g)(5)".

(c) ENHANCED SUPERVISION.—Section 115 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5325) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "large, interconnected bank holding companies" and inserting "bank holding companies which have been the subject of a final determination under section 113";

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or" at the end and inserting a period;

(B) by striking "the Council may" and all that follows through "differentiate" and inserting "the Council may differentiate"; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(3) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "subsections (a) and (b) of section 113" each place